

JULIUS ROSENWALD, THE PHILANTHROPIST WHO PAYS WOMEN A BEGGARLY WAGE

By N. D. Cochran, Editor of The Day Book.

Now I have an opinion of Julius Rosenwald, Chicago's multi-millionaire philanthropist, the genius of the great mail-order house of the Sears-Roebuck Co.

I don't get it from what the newspapers say when they slobber over him, nor by what high-brow uplifters and social reformers, who have handled some of his money, say about him.

I get it from what Julius Rosenwald himself says; and he is condemned out of his own mouth as an industrial hog who has piled up millions by paying girls and women less than they can decently live on.

I am not surprised. It is what I expected, for I have run across his type of philanthropist before.

Julius Rosenwald was a member of the Chicago Vice Commission. His name was signed to the official report of that commission, in which this statement is made:

"Hundreds, if not thousands, of girls from country towns, and those born in the city, but who have been thrown on their own resources, are compelled to live in cheap boarding houses on the average wage of six dollars. How do they exist on this sum? It is impossible to figure it out on a mathematical basis. If the wage were \$8 per week, and the girl paid \$2.50 for her room, \$1 for laundry, and 60 cents for car fare, she would have less than 50 cents left at the end of the week. That is provided she ate 10 cent breakfasts, 15 cent luncheons and 25 cent dinners. But there is no doubt that many girls DO live on even \$6 and do it HONESTLY, but we can affirm that they DO NOT have nourishing food, or comfortable shelter, or warm clothes, or any amusement, except perhaps free public dances, without outside help either from charity in the shape of girls' clubs, or friends in the country home; how can she possibly exist to say nothing of live?

"Is it any wonder that a tempted girl who receives only \$6 per week working with her hands sells her body for \$25 per week when she learns there is a demand for it and men are willing to pay the price? On the one hand her employer demands honesty, faithfulness and a 'clean and neat appearance,' and for all this he contributes from his profits an average of \$6 for every week. Her honesty alone is worth this inadequate wage, disregarding the consideration of her efficiency. In the sad life of prostitution, on the other hand, we find here the employer, demanding the surrender of her virtue, pays her an average of \$25 per week. Which employer wins this half starved CHILD to his side in this unequal battle? It would be un-